

REMARKS

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed March 22, 2006. Claims 1-8 and 10-14 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-8 and 10-14. The present Response amends claims 1, 10 and 11, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration of claims 1-8 and 10-14. Reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested.

I. Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

Claims 1, 10 and 11, the phrase “having limited display space” renders the claim(s) indefinite because the claim(s) include(s) elements not actually disclosed (those encompassed by “having limited display space”), thereby rendering the scope of the claim(s) unascertainable.

The phrase “having limited display space” in claims 1, 10 and 11 has been removed as it is inherent of any mobile device, and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection with respect to these claims be withdrawn.

II. Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

Claims 1, 2 and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Martin, Jr. et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,610,105 (hereinafter Martin).

As discussed in detail in Applicant's Response on July 27, 2005, the claimed invention focuses on “dynamic” detection, search and identification in real time of data items in ANY web page based on URL designated by the user. In contrast, although Martin teaches generating a customized menu to display a Web content (col. 12, lines 50-col. 13, line 5), the content itself is “static” as it is limited to what's returned by “a central content server” (col. 2, line 41-42), not Web page of any URL designated by the user in the present invention. Dynamic content detection, search and identification of any Web pages in real time is much more complicated than merely customizing display of the static content from a server. Therefore, Martin cannot

anticipate the present invention in independent claim 1. Since claims 2, 12 -14 depend on claim 1, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) be withdrawn.

III. Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

1. Claims 3-5 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin in view of De Boor et al., U.S. Pat. No. 6,675,204 (hereinafter De Boor).

De Boor teaches “a wireless communication device with a markup language based man-machine interface for telecommunication functionality” (Abstract). It does not teach dynamic data detection from Web content information as claimed by the present invention in claim 1. *Martin* cannot anticipate the dynamic content detention in claim 1 either as discussed above. Since claims 3-5 and 7 depend on claim 1, *Martin* in view of De Boor cannot render claims 3-5 and 7 obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for at least this reason, and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection with respect to these claims be withdrawn.

2. Claims 10 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin in view of Buckham et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,662,016 (hereinafter Buckham).

Buckham teaches improving the “availability and delivery of graphical location information regarding mobile resources” (col. 2, line 24-26), such as maps to “a client side of a data-enabled network interface” (col. 2, line 37-40). It does not teach detecting/identifying content data items dynamically in a Web page. Therefore, neither Martin nor Buckham can anticipate independent claims 1 and 10 of the present invention. Since claims 6 depends on claim 1, Martin in view of Buckham cannot render claims 10 and 6 obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for at least this reason, and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection with respect to these claims be withdrawn.

3. Claims 11 and 8, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over De Boor, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,675,204 (hereinafter De Boor) in view of Buckham.

As discussed above, neither De Boor nor Buckham teaches dynamic data detection from Web content information as claimed by the present invention in claim 1 and 11. Since claims 8 depends on claim 1, De Boor in view of Buckham cannot render claims 11 and 8 obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for at least this reason, and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection with respect to these claims be withdrawn.


IV. Conclusion

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 6/22/06

By: 
David T. Xue
Reg. No. 54,554

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
Four Embarcadero Center, Fourth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-4156
Telephone: (415) 362-3800
Customer No. 23910